IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Criminal Action

VS.

No. 13-270

ATIBA WARREN,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Transcript of SENTENCING HEARING proceedings recorded on September 12, 2016, in the United States District Court, 700 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, before The Hon. Mark R. Hornak, United States District Judge

**APPEARANCES:** 

For the Government: Katherine A. King, Esq.

United States Attorney's Office

700 Grant Street, Ste. 4000

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

For the Defendant: R. Damien Schorr, Esq.

1015 Irwin Drive

Pittsburgh, PA 15236

Court Reporter: Deborah Rowe, RMR, CRR

700 Grant Street, Ste. 5300

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

(412) 471–2510

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (9:34 a.m.; in open court, Defendant present:) 4 THE COURT: We're here this morning in the case of 5 the United States of America versus Mr. Atiba Warren pending 6 on the docket at 13-cr-270. Will counsel for the United 7 States please enter her appearance? 8 MS. KING: Good morning, Your Honor. Katherine 9 King for the United States. 10 THE COURT: Good morning, Miss King. Will counsel 11 for Mr. Warren please enter his appearance? 12 MR. SCHORR: Damien Schorr for Mr. Warren. 13 THE COURT: Good to see you also, Mr. Schorr. Ms. 14 King, Mr. Schorr, is it all right if we handle today's 15 proceeding with everyone keeping their seats at counsel 16 table? Does that work for you, Miss King? 17 MS. KING: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King. Does that work 19 for you, Mr. Schorr? 20 MR. SCHORR: Sure. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, if you could slide your 22 microphone in that way, we can be sure we hear you. Mr. 23 Babik, would you please administer an oath to Mr. Warren? 24 You may keep your seat, sir. 25 (The Defendant was duly sworn.)

1 MR. BABIK: Please state your name for the record. 2 THE DEFENDANT: Atiba Warren. 3 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Warren. 4 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, as we get started here 6 today, there are a few preliminary matters I would like to go 7 over with you, sir. First, just to confirm for the record, 8 you are represented by a lawyer. That lawyer is Mr. Damien 9 Schorr, and he is seated right next to you at that table, 10 sir; correct? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Warren, you understand that we're here in Federal court today so that the Court 13 14 could set the sentence in your case? 15 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 16 THE COURT: And Mr. Warren, have you had enough 17 time and opportunity to talk about today's hearing in your 18 case with your lawyer, Mr. Schorr? 19 THE DEFENDANT: I have. 20 THE COURT: And Mr. Warren, are you satisfied with 21 the job that Mr. Schorr has done for you as your lawyer? 2.2. THE DEFENDANT: Yes. He's done an excellent job, 23 sir. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Warren. Mr. Warren, let 25 me ask you this, sir. In the last 24 hours have you taken or

```
1
     used any prescribed or nonprescribed medicine or drugs?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No. Not that's going to affect me,
 3
     no.
               THE COURT: Have you taken anything at all, sir?
 4
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Anti-inflammatories.
 6
               THE COURT: That's because the doctors prescribed
 7
     that for you?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes.
 9
               THE COURT: And it works for you?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes. My hips, my hip problem.
11
               THE COURT: And let me ask you this, Mr. Warren.
12
     In the time that you've been taking that anti-inflammatory,
13
     have you ever noticed that it gets in the way of you
14
     understanding what's going on around you?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
16
               THE COURT: You're good to go today, sir?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: And other than your hip situation that
19
     you've talked about, have you recently been under the care of
20
     any type of doctor or health care person for anything else?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
2.2.
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Warren.
23
               THE DEFENDANT: You're welcome, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, based on all the
25
     information available to you, do you have any doubt as to
```

Mr. Warren's competence to participate in today's hearing?

MR. SCHORR: No, sir.

2.2.

THE COURT: And Miss King, based on all the information available to you, do you have any doubts as to Mr. Warren's competence to participate in today's hearing?

MS. KING: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Warren, based on your answers to my questions, my observations here in open court, the representations of your lawyer, Mr. Schorr, and Miss King's, the lawyer for the United States, I find that you are competent to participate in today's hearing.

Counsel, I'm confident based on the filings that have been made in this case that all counsel are familiar with each and every one of the relevant matters that are on the docket in this case. I would highlight a number of them, however, for the record.

Back on October 30, 2015, a jury returned a unanimous verdict after a trial in open court in which Mr. Warren was represented by counsel, finding him guilty of Count 1 of the indictment in this proceeding charging possession of a firearm by a convicted felon.

Thereafter, the probation office prepared in the normal course a presentence report and made it available to the Court and counsel on January 29, 2016. I would note that present in the courtroom seated in the jury box is United

1 States Probation Officer Andrew Waszyn. 2 Thereafter, the probation office made available and circulated in a similar fashion the addendum to the 3 4 presentence report on February 16, 2016. 5 Thereafter, the Defendant has filed a number of 6 position statements, memoranda and other materials relevant 7 to sentencing on February 5, May 11, July 22, July 26, 8 July 27, August 22, August 23, August 26 and August 29, 2016. 9 The United States filed similar materials on 10 February 4, February 12, May 2, July 22, August 14, August 23 11 and August 26 of 2016. 12 Thereafter, the Court filed tentative findings on 13 August 24, 2016, and thereafter, based on matters raised at 14 the initial sentencing hearing in this court and the 15 supplemental memoranda filed by counsel, vacated those 16 tentative findings and issued amended tentative findings on 17 September 1, 2016. 18 Miss King, have you reviewed each of the documents 19 to which I've referred? 20 MS. KING: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: And Mr. Schorr, have you done likewise 2.2. and also reviewed them with your client, Mr. Warren? 23 MR. SCHORR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Warren, have you reviewed each of the documents to which I've just referred and, in particular,

24

25

1 the presentence report, the addendum to the presentence 2 report and each of the Court's tentative findings? 3 THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor, yes. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Warren. 5 THE DEFENDANT: You're welcome. 6 THE COURT: I would confirm for the record that the 7 sentencing quidelines have by decisions of our United States 8 Supreme Court been declared to be advisory to the Court. 9 That means, among other things, that the sentencing 10 quidelines themselves are no longer mandatory, and a 11 sentencing Court may not presume or take for granted that an 12 advisory quideline range or a particular quideline sentence 13 is reasonable in a specific case. Therefore, the guidelines 14 are not only not mandatory; they're not presumed to be 15 reasonable in a given case. 16 Miss King, are there any identifiable victims in 17 this case for whom notice of today's hearing was required to 18 be given; and, if so, has such notice been given? 19 MS. KING: There are no victims, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King. 21 I would confirm for the record that the Court's 2.2. reviewed the complete file in this case that includes the 23 presentence report, the addendum to the presentence report, 24 each and every position statement submitted by counsel for

the parties in the case, all of the letters regarding

25

2.2.

sentencing that have been submitted to the Court, along with the recommendation of the probation office.

I would confirm for the record that pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure, 32(e)(3), that recommendation is not disclosed to counsel for the United States, counsel for the Defendant or the Defendant. But I would also confirm that in determining the sentence in this case, the Court will not consider and has not considered any factual or legal matter that has not been disclosed to the Defendant and to all counsel.

Miss King, is the United States seeking or moving for a formal departure, as that term is used under the sentencing quidelines?

MS. KING: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Mr. Schorr, is the Defendant moving for or seeking a formal departure, as that term is used under the sentencing guidelines?

MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King, and thank you, Mr. Schorr.

Miss King, based on the Court's review of the record, it appears based on the findings contained in the presentence report and set forth in the Court's tentative findings, by statute there is a mandatory minimum sentence of imprisonment applicable in this case of 180 months or 15

1 years pursuant to Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 2 924(e). Is that your understanding? 3 MS. KING: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, do you have any different 4 5 understanding? 6 MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor. But I do want to note 7 that in preparing for today I noted that a case before you, 8 Al-Akili I believe his name was, who was a career offender, 9 armed career criminal with a case similar to Mr. Warren's, 10 who got less than 15 years. I'm not guite sure how that 11 happened, but somehow it did. 12 I looked at the docket. A lot of the proceedings 13 I couldn't get to them, but I do want to note are sealed. 14 that from what I could view, the Third Circuit didn't mention 15 anything about the sentence being under the statutory 16 mandatory minimum at all on appeal. THE COURT: Right. Mr. Al-Akili, as I recall, 17 18 appealed that sentence, and it was affirmed on appeal. 19 MR. SCHORR: Correct, but he got less than 180 20 months on the sentence, if I recall correctly. 21 THE COURT: I think your recollection is correct. 22 MR. SCHORR: So for whatever -- somehow you were 23 able to get him under 180 months. I don't know how it 24 happened. I just couldn't find that out. 25 But if you're inclined to go under 180 months for

1 Mr. Warren for the same reasons, for whatever reasons you 2 could find, I'm asking you to do so. 3 THE COURT: Understood, Mr. Schorr, and we'll make 4 sure you and Miss King and Mr. Warren have an opportunity to 5 tell the Court anything, anything at all that you think the 6 Court should be aware of prior to imposing sentence. 7 Miss King, does the United States have any 8 objections to any of the matters set forth in the presentence 9 report, the addendum or the Court's amended tentative 10 findings in this case? 11 MS. KING: No, Your Honor. 12 Thank you, Miss King. Mr. Schorr, THE COURT: 13 other than the matters that have been set forth and preserved 14 in the filings you made on Mr. Warren's behalf, does 15 Mr. Warren have any other objections to any of the matters 16 reported in the presentence report, the addendum or the 17 Court's amended tentative findings? 18 MR. SCHORR: I do want to place one objection on 19 the record, Your Honor. It really starts it looks to me on 20 page 8 of your amended tentative findings. 21 THE COURT: Let me flip to that, sir, so I have it

THE COURT: Let me flip to that, sir, so I have it in front of me. Mr. Schorr, I'm good to go.

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHORR: In here you use the Wadlow case, spelled W-a-d-l-o-w, from the Maryland courts. And I don't believe Wadlow treats armed robbery and simple robbery as

separate offenses. I don't recall them saying that in that decision. It's still robbery with the enhancement of a dangerous or deadly weapon.

And the problem with that is that leaves you then as you move on in your tentative findings to use the modified categorical approach in analyzing Mr. Warren's conviction there, and I object on that grounds also because it should just be a — it should just be categorical — it's not a divisible statute. It wasn't at the time of the offense.

It's not the same statute -- and I called this to your attention at the last hearing we had -- that's in effect now. Maryland has since amended that statute.

So I wanted to put that objection on the record for purposes of appeal, that I disagree with how the Court's reached its conclusion. I don't think it's a divisible statute. I don't think armed robbery has ever been held to be a separate offense by Maryland courts.

And while I respect what the Supreme Court has said in the Mathis case, they did not address in there what they also said in Johnson, that they are bound by State court interpretations of what are the elements of the State crime.

And so Mathis doesn't give us any guidance in that regard. And I want to preserve those objections for purposes of appeal.

THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, as far as I'm concerned,

and I'm not — I don't think it's this Court that has the final say on that, but as far as I'm concerned, you've preserved them with me.

MR. SCHORR: I understand that. My real concern is I've seen in the past where the Government, when I file an appeal brief, I've done it on fifty appeals, they say, well, he didn't object enough. So I want to make sure I'm objecting all the way to the bitter end.

THE COURT: And Mr. Schorr, you're not — as far as the Court's concerned, you're not duplicatively objecting.

And I think there's case law — although I think the Molina case from this past June identifies how the Supreme Court views the obligation of the District Courts to correctly calculate the advisory guidelines and the broad sweep of review of that calculation. But there's no problem with the Court with you placing that objection on the record again this morning.

Miss King, if you'd like to say anything, you're welcome to. You're not obligated to, but I'm happy to hear from you regarding what Mr. Schorr's just said.

MS. KING: I don't have anything, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, I understand your objection. It is one that has been made by you on Mr. Warren's behalf in a number of fashions, in writing and orally up until now.

2.2.

I do believe Justice Kagan's decision in Mathis is the latest word on what the Supreme Court considers and what it directs the District Courts consider to be an element, sometimes parallel to the affirmative use of those words by the Courts of the state; but I think Justice Kagan, writing for a majority of the Supreme Court in Mathis, was very clear, and I tried to note that in the one footnote in the tentative findings.

She did not liken it to an element. She didn't say it was akin to an element. She didn't say it was like an element. She said it's an element.

MR. SCHORR: I understand that. The other concern would be that now the District Courts step into the State court realm, and they're saying, no, we're going to define what is an element of a Maryland crime, and that is — Johnson says you can't do that. So I just want to make sure I have that preserved.

THE COURT: You have, as far as I'm concerned, preserved it, Mr. Schorr. For the reasons set forth in the Court's amended tentative findings, I'll overrule the objection. But I understand it, and I attempted to address it in the Court's amended tentative findings. Anything else along those lines, Mr. Schorr?

MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court will adopt the findings of

2.2.

fact and other conclusions set forth in the presentence report, the addendum, and in its amended tentative findings that relate at all to sentencing in this case subject to any necessity to amend or modify them based on matters that are raised during the proceeding today.

At this point, Mr. Schorr, we'll hear from you on behalf of Mr. Warren regarding any matters relative to sentencing. When you tell me you're done, I'll then address Mr. Warren personally and directly.

When I do that, Mr. Warren, that will be your opportunity to tell the Court anything, literally anything at all you would like me to know, including about your case, your situation, you. But really, without limit, anything you want me to be aware of or to know, that will be an opportunity for you to tell me that.

When you're done, we'll turn the floor over to Miss King, and we'll hear from Miss King on behalf of the United States. And when that's done, we'll make sure that both Miss King and Mr. Schorr have the final opportunity to advise the Court of anything that they believe the Court should know.

So with that, Mr. Schorr, the floor is yours.

MR. SCHORR: Thank you, Your Honor. Well, as it stands here now, you have a choice of either sentencing

Mr. Warren to the mandatory minimum of 15 years or 180 months

2.2.

or going into the guidelines sentence, which I believe starts at 260 months --

THE COURT: Based on what I found in the amended tentative findings, I believe it's 210 months for purposes of this case.

MR. SCHORR: Well, under the parsimony provision of the sentencing statute, 180 months is sufficient and no greater than necessary. That's the bottom line that Congress has said as far as this kind of crime is concerned.

And as far as Mr. Warren is concerned, when you look at him, you've got a now 36-year-old man with bad health problems with his hips, he's got diabetes, possibly some mental health issues. And so he's not your run-of-the-mill young gang banger who may come out and be young enough to get in trouble again.

He's not going to be the same man when he comes out of prison after 15 years than he is today going in. He's going to be substantially older, more infirmed. We don't know what kind of issues he's going to face with his health moving forward.

He is diabetic. That complicates every other health issue that somebody encounters. He needs more work done on his hips. He's already had one replaced, and I believe the other one is going bad also.

So when you consider all those factors, I think

2.2.

that 180 months is appropriate. And not only that, the nature of the offense here, he was not out on the street brandishing a gun or engaging in illegal drug transactions.

To my knowledge, no contraband was found in his house when the police searched it. They came into his house pursuant to their investigating an incident that happened outside, and my understanding is they saw Mr. Warren with a gun at that time.

I can understand they go in for their own safety, but it's not as if he was acting in a dangerous manner in terms of endangering anybody else.

So this is not a man who was a threat to anybody at the time of his arrest. And so to that end, 180 months, which you must sentence him to at least, should — there's no reason to go above it. He has support from family and friends. You saw several letters from his family and friends.

And he has had a hard life growing up. If you recall, he didn't have the best home life growing up. He's had — been in and out of — on the streets as a young man, but he's been trying to turn his life around.

So when you sit here and look at this man, I'm asking you to sentence him to no more than 180 months because I think that's sufficient but no greater than necessary, given the nature of this case. And I'm done.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schorr. 2 Mr. Warren, I'll now go beyond you personally and 3 directly. This is your opportunity to tell me anything, 4 literally anything at all that you would like me to know or 5 be aware of, sir. 6 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Can I confer with my counsel 7 real quick? 8 THE COURT: Absolutely. 9 (Brief pause.) 10 THE COURT: Mr. Warren? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I want to first of all 12 say to the Court it's been a rough couple years, you know. 13 feel like I'm here for, you know, nothing, not for like --14 this is probably overzealous police work. 15 I feel like they illegally searched the house. 16 That's why I took it to trial. 17 All my cases in the State, I did plead on the armed 18 robbery, and that was on the advice of counsel with the plea 19 condition that the armed robbery would be off my record. I wasn't aware these robberies were in the record until I 20 21 caught the Federal piece. 22 All that's in the record for the Court to see that 23 this was a condition of my plea with the armed robbery. I 24 would have never pled out to the armed robberies if it had 25 not explicitly stated that they would be removed from my

record once the probation was completed.

2.2.

I completed the probation. Somehow there was a clerical error on behalf of Baltimore City, and I'm getting punished for that right now.

I've been punished for my crimes that I paid my debt to society for. I left Baltimore, which is a substantially more violent and faster moving city than Pittsburgh. I didn't leave Baltimore City to come to Pittsburgh and pick up guns when I didn't pick up guns in Baltimore.

I'm not a violent person. I have three kids that depend on me, that need me, that I've been missing their life, and I'm supportive of financially and emotionally when I was home.

I told nobody to come to court because I don't -- I have had family members pass away, and I don't want to bring no more stress to the people through this time because they know I didn't do anything wrong, and I feel like -- you know, it's not justice being served.

But, you know, I feel like everything happens for a reason. So I try to use this time and find a silver lining in every cloud. And that's what I'm doing right now, trying to better myself with programs, you know, reading books, self-help books, business books. I was hurting when I had to retire from plumbing because that's something I love.

2.2.

You know, I made mistakes in my younger age. I'm 36 now, and 36 in Baltimore years makes me feel like I'm midage because I have a lot of friends that died right next to me with their brains on my shoulder. I watched my mother OD when I was seven.

I'm not asking for pity. I'm asking for mercy from Your Honor. Fifteen years is — I got two bad hips. I might not be alive in 15 years. I might not be alive in the next three or four years. Who knows? That I can't say.

But I feel like this is for a gun, and you got people that go to stores and buy guns and shoot people. I didn't have -- I didn't touch a gun. It wasn't -- there was no fingerprint. One word off of one officer out of twelve officers that was at the scene.

I felt it was shabby police work at best. I feel there was a crime committed five blocks away from where I was standing. I was woke from my sleep, just had total hip replacement.

I had surgery in August of 2012. I got out of the hospital in September to the nursing home. I was walking with a cane, crutches, and/or walker. This is impossible for me to walk around with a gun. And I have enough brains — last time I caught it, I was at a 143 IQ — to have a gun while you got twelve police officers outside, and I confessed in the police car with audio and video? Where's the

confession at?

2.2.

I mean I feel like I just got railroaded from the jump, and you've been a fair and impartial — you know, a good Judge in my view from my first experience with Federal court.

And I ask Your Honor, if there's any way that you could sentence me under, and I'm the one that brought the case to Mr. Schorr, because that's all I do. I work on my case. I look over the computer. I see your rulings, and I sense that you are a fair Judge.

I'm asking you if there's anything possible that you could do to get me back to my family. I missed most of my daughter's life. My son was just born. He's three years old. I missed his whole life. I never had a chance to meet him. I ask all this to — I ask the mercy of the Court, Your Honor.

I mean I'm at a loss of words because this is what I'm stuck with. I'm curious why would the police be here watching me get sentenced? This is like vindictive prosecution.

I feel like I'm getting labeled because of the city
I was born in that I left. I made a conscious decision to
leave to come to Pittsburgh where my mother was originally
born and raised, to start fresh because I don't want to have
the same issues that I had in Baltimore, you know, the same

death threats, the same situations, guilty by association.

I'm being, you know, judged by my past. I can't even start fresh. And I feel like I was doing good. I was -- you know, I had a little apartment. I was collecting my disability. I was just living the normal life.

For once in my life out of all the time I've been living, I actually could look over my shoulder and don't have to worry about somebody putting a gun to my head and threatening to kill me.

I have to say I'm at a loss of words because this don't seem real. Fifteen years? I mean 15 years is the reason — it would be a blessing for Your Honor because I knew the guidelines, the 210 to 262. But enough is enough. I mean I lost everything. I don't have nothing to go home to.

So when I go home, if my family is still alive, my children are there, I don't have anything to go home to because the little bit that I did accumulate I spent going through this process here. I mean I don't call that like rehabilitation.

I've been rehabilitated to myself through books and programs and everything that's offered to me at Allegheny County, CCA.

I haven't had any kind of pain management or anything. I've been just dealing with the pain. At times I

2.2.

can't get up. I got sickle cell. Sometimes I can't move my body, but they don't give me any kind of medical treatment.

So I ask Your Honor, that if worse come to worse, that no more than 15 years. And hopefully sometime within that time Congress will change, some kind of laws be passed that will be beneficial to my cause and my case.

And I ask that you send me to a medical facility where I can get medical treatment for my needs because I haven't -- I didn't get it in Allegheny County. I haven't got it at Northeast Ohio.

I just ask that you send me to a facility that can cater to my needs, because the doctors put off the surgery because they thought I might have a chance of going home. So they don't want to go and work on one hip where they need to go back and work on the other one. So they're not trying to touch the right hip until they get the left hip squared away, and it's clear in the medical records.

I know the PSI guy, he twisted and contorted the words, but it's clear as day. Like Mercy Hospital, the hospital I been seeing at Youngstown, they don't want to do nothing. I'm still having problems with the left hip, and I don't have a good leg to stand on.

And I know it might be a common occurrence to the BOP, but not that I know of because, if that was the case, they would have done the surgery. I need the surgery done on

my right hip since I been locked up. They wanted to do it right away; but the doctor said, no, you got to give it a chance to heal.

2.2.

The left hip never healed properly due to my arrest, not the proper rehab. And I just ask that you sentence me — if you have to sentence me — which you have to obviously because we here today — to the mandatory minimum, and send me to a medical facility where I can get the treatment that I deserve and I need, that the Eighth Amendment allows me to, and think about my family, my kids when you making this decision.

Think of all the news and all the things that's going on in the world. I'm not a bad person. I don't have a violent past. I feel like my criminal history overrepresents me. But where I come up, where I came up, I feel like I did good, you know, because I'm still alive. And I made it through the trap that was set, and I made a few mistakes, and I owned up to those.

And I never took a case to jury trial ever in my life. And I was terrified. But I never touched this gun. I never had it. It was never in my possession. And I contend that. I never had a gun in Baltimore City. I never had a gun here.

And that's what I ask Your Honor to consider. I don't know what else -- I think I pretty much addressed

everything. And I just ask you for mercy. I'm a God-fearing person.

I mean I'm still mad for this whole situation.

It's like it's not real. Because I felt like I could have stayed in Baltimore City and got the same result. I feel like I'm the same right now because I left Baltimore to come to Pittsburgh, and I still got the same results.

And I tried to change those things, and here I am in front of Your Honor with a gun case. And I don't have that kind of past.

Thank you, Your Honor.

2.2.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Warren. Mr. Schorr, anything else you'd like to say at this time?

MR. SCHORR: Well, I'd like to ask Your Honor to recommend, number one, that Mr. Warren be placed as close to Baltimore as possible and to a Federal Medical Center. I believe the closest one might be the one at Butner, North Carolina.

And I'd asked you at our previous hearing, and I remind you, he was in State custody for some time — I'm not quite sure how long — before the Federal charges came up. Several months, and you held the Bureau of Prisons — that case was dropped. So that time, I'm asking you to tell the Bureau of Prisons or recommend that they credit that toward his Federal sentence.

Beyond that, I have nothing else to say, Your Honor.

2.2.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schorr. At this time we'll turn the floor over to Miss King to hear from her on behalf of the United States.

MS. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. The Court here had an opportunity that it does not often have in Federal cases where there was a trial, and the Court had the opportunity to hear from the Government's witnesses, the police officers that were there on the night Mr. Warren was arrested, and had the opportunity to assess their testimony and their believability.

As the Court will recall, the officers were at Mr. Warren's residence that night for a completely unrelated incident. There was a person stabbed who basically was dying on the front porch, and they were there assisting that person.

And Officer Sywyj, who is here today, was interviewing a witness to that stabbing and looked up and saw Mr. Warren walking toward the front door with an enormous gun in his hand, and that's what he saw. And that's what happened.

And so I think it's disingenuous for the Defendant to argue at a sentencing motion and again today that the conduct that was involved that night was some type of

innocent conduct where no one was at risk of being harmed.

2.2.

Mr. Warren made statements to Officer Hoyson that he heard his cousin had been stabbed, and he went and got his gun, and, notably, a gun that he bought illegally on the street that had the serial numbers filed off when he bought it.

You have to ask yourself what was he going to do with that gun? What were the plans and his intentions with a gun that night? I don't think it was probably to stay inside of his house; and thankfully, the officers were there to stop him from doing whatever he planned to do with that gun.

I think that the Court needs to take into consideration those actions that occurred that night, the situation that was presented to the officers and Mr. Warren's decisions that night to go and grab his gun when he heard that a crime of violence had been committed against a person that he described as his cousin.

And so while there is a mandatory minimum in this case, it's the Government's position that a guideline sentence is more appropriate in this case --

THE COURT: Let me ask you about that, Miss King.

One of the — in the Court's experience, that I recognize is even at this point relatively limited, one of the things I think I've observed is that whether we're talking about the career offender provisions of the advisory guidelines or the

2.2.

armed career criminal provisions of the Federal statute, that the intention in the case of the statute, Congress's intention or, in the case of the guidelines, which are applicable here, the Sentencing Commission's, is that in certain cases where there is a qualifying criminal history, that what would otherwise be the recommended sentence get amplified to recognize that acute criminal history, where it's significant and it's persistent and it's of a limited number of very serious crimes.

So both the sentencing guidelines and the statutes say to the Judges sentences should be amplified when there is this certain type of criminal record, which the Court has found, with lots of advice from counsel on both sides, is applicable in Mr. Warren's case.

So then the question is how much of an amplification? Because if this were not an armed career criminal case, as I understand it, the maximum sentence would be 120 months.

So the amplification occurs. We already have a 50 percent amplification because it is an armed career criminal case. And if it were not an armed career criminal case and we were looking just at the guidelines, I think — and it's obviously not a binding part of the case — the advisory guideline sentence would have been 130 to 162 months of imprisonment, which then gets adjusted down to 120 months

because of what would then be the statutory maximum.

2.2.

What's the perspective of the United States of how much the sentence should be amplified in this case? Because there is no question, what would otherwise be the sentence will be amplified because of Mr. Warren's criminal record and the nature of the offense of conviction here. What are your thoughts in those regards?

MS. KING: It's my position that a sentence within the guidelines — at the low end of the guidelines, 210 months would be appropriate in this case, but I think you do have to take into consideration —

THE COURT: So that's a 75 percent increase.

MS. KING: Okay. I think you have to take into consideration again all of the factors, including all of the sentencing factors. This was a person who had an obliterated serial number, a gun with an obliterated serial number, a person who is prohibited from having a gun from multiple, multiple offenses, including a prior event involving a gun where three people were held up by gunpoint by this Defendants and robbed.

THE COURT: So the second of those is an element of the offense of conviction. I understand the point on the obliterated serial number.

MS. KING: I think in totality you have to look at all of the factors regardless of whether it's an element or

2.2.

not, Your Honor. You're looking at this individual person and the conduct that's involved here and throughout his criminal history.

And so I do think that if the Sentencing Commission had intended for every armed career criminal to receive a 15-year sentence and that's it, then that's what they would have done. But they don't.

They make other considerations for amplifying the sentences based upon — I mean the sentence here is particularly driven by his criminal history. Because the minimum criminal history category for an armed career criminal could be a four, and he's not a four. He's a five, and it's my position that he should be a six, in fact, based upon arguments that we have previously had here.

And so if he was a six, his guideline range would be even higher. So I think that it is the obligation of the Court to look at all the sentencing factors, and obviously the Court can sentence the Defendant to whatever sentence the Court finds to be appropriate.

But it's the Government's position that, taking into consideration the guidelines range, which is determined by the Sentencing Commission, for this particular Defendant in conjunction with all of his factors, that there's no reason to vary from the guideline range here. That's why we think a guideline sentence would be appropriate.

2.2.

THE COURT: And help me understand, Miss King, from the position of the United States, and Mr. Schorr, I'll be asking you a similar question, but it's a bit of a mirror image, why in this case would a sentence of 180 months be insufficient to fulfill the purposes of sentencing?

MS. KING: I think in this case looking at the factors of the conduct of this particular Defendant in general, it is significant conduct. I think it's required to be punished by a significant sentence. And I don't believe that there's a reason to vary from the guideline range in this case.

THE COURT: And is it the position of the United States that 180 months would not be a significant sentence? Because that's --

MS. KING: No. That is clearly a significant sentence, and I would never say that it is not. It is clearly a significant sentence. But I do believe that the appropriate sentence is within the guideline range in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that, Miss King.

Mr. Schorr, to follow-up on the colloquy that I've had with Miss King, the calculated advisory guideline range, and I recognize, and I do my best to follow the direction of the United States Supreme Court, that for a sentencing Court, a District Court as opposed to a Court of Appeals, there is

no presumption of reasonableness of an advisory guideline sentence.

2.2.

So I want to be very clear in asking you this question. I am not starting from a presumption of reasonableness.

But as recently as the Molina decision in June of this year, the Supreme Court indicated — I don't know that they used the phrase starting point, but they indicated that the beginning — one of the reasons that the accurate calculation numerically of the guideline range is so important is that it is an initial starting point for factors that the Court considers, and it is one of the enumerated factors under 3553(a).

The United States has argued both in its papers —
it's not something Miss King's just arguing today, but she's
added to it in the argument today — that a sentence that is
not within the advisory guidelines would not be sufficient to
fulfill the purposes of sentencing.

Why do you believe that a sentence above 180 months on behalf of Mr. Warren would be a sentence that's greater than necessary to fulfill the purposes of sentencing for any reason, but, in particular, the matters Miss King's highlighted here in Court today?

MR. SCHORR: Well, one of the factors Mr. King — Miss King highlighted was that Mr. Warren used a gun in his

1 previous conviction for armed robbery. He did not. He used 2 a BB gun. And that was in the papers the Government 3 submitted to the Court. Many times -- when we looked at his 4 2002 conviction, he had multiple counts in that indictment, 5 one of which said he had a BB qun. 6 So the Government is mischaracterizing to some 7 extent how severe his actions were at that point. Yes, he 8 had a robbery, and they called it robbery with a dangerous or 9 deadly weapon; but it was a BB qun. 10 So I have not heard of anybody being shot to death 11 with a BB qun. It might happen in some stray, freak 12 situation, but it's not what I would consider to be deadly. 13 In a literal sense. THE COURT: 14 MR. SCHORR: In a literal sense. You get hurt, get 15 stung, you could get shot in the eye. We all know the movie 16 Christmas Story, "You'll shoot your eye out," or whatever the 17 line is, but when you look at Mr. King --18 THE COURT: Mr. Warren.

MR. SCHORR: I don't know why I keep saying that --

THE COURT: Because I keep referring to Miss King.

MR. SCHORR: Yes. When you look at Mr. Warren, so his other two offenses were for drugs. Now, he would be facing the same guidelines sentence today if he had in the past taken an AK-47 and shoved it into somebody's face and said give me your clothes. I think that was the proceeds of

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

2.2.

the crime for armed robbery. He took somebody's jacket or jackets or something — wallets possibly, where he would have had a weapon that was meant to kill people.

Or if he had pulled a knife to stab them, you would have the same criminal history here. You would have the same quidelines calculation.

And then you would look at him and say, Mr. Warren, you're redeemable. But this guy used a BB gun. So I think you have to factor that into your consideration.

Now, the guidelines are advisory only for you. So you can look at the factors of the person's past and determine, well, is this guy really that bad a guy?

I mean for the Government to argue that he should get 210 months for a crime — and he's being punished for his past offenses because he hasn't learned obviously, but because he keeps getting in trouble; but he would be facing the same sentence if he was a serious — he had a serious deadly weapon, I mean a real deadly weapon in his possession at the time.

THE COURT: Would he be facing the same calculation of the advisory guidelines? Whether the United States would make a different argument if he had an AK-47 or a KA-BAR knife or those things is a different thing, but you're correct. The mathematical calculation would be the same.

But it's quite possible the United States would be arguing

for a sentence somewhere far different within the advisory quidelines.

2.2.

MR. SCHORR: It's possible. They could argue for 262 months. But they're telling you they want you to go in that range, of that guideline range.

And what I'm saying here is you've got a guy — he won't get out of prison until he's 46 years old with bad hips — I mean with a 180-month sentence, he's got about three years in.

THE DEFENDANT: Three and a half.

MR. SCHORR: Three and a half years in now. He's going to be 46 years old with bad hips, diabetes, mental health problems, sickle cell. So all these factors together I think point more toward a 180-month sentence rather than a 210 to 262-month sentence. That's all part of the 3553(a) factors that you have to consider.

So to that end, the Government I don't think carries the burden of saying that he should get more than 180 months. I mean it's supposed to be sufficient but no greater than necessary.

You're basically by putting — today Mr. Warren is going to lose the rest of his youth when he goes to prison today because he's going to lose 15 more years of his life. The time he's already been in prison, as I said, he'll be in his mid to late forties when he gets out; and as he pointed

1 out, he may not be alive. We don't know. 2 That's a horrifically long sentence, 180 months, 3 and that is sufficient but no greater than necessary to 4 punish a man for the crime here. 5 Now, going to what Miss King told you, obviously I 6 didn't do the trial. Mr. Sindler did. I haven't reviewed 7 the trial transcripts because they're not pertinent to what I 8 had to do. 9 I don't know if Mr. Warren knew at the time of his 10 arrest whether the police were there on the front porch. 11 knows? But he knew something violent had happened to a 12 family member. Maybe he was going to defend them. 13 I mean the Government kind of implies that maybe he 14 was going to shoot a police officer. That's not necessarily 15 the case. Maybe he thought my cousin's badly hurt. I got to 16 go see what I can do. We don't know that. And it invites 17 speculation to punish him based on what we don't know. 18 mean that's wrong on its face. 19 So 180 months is sufficient, Your Honor. That's 20 all you need to do to this man.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schorr. Miss King?

I'll give you the final word.

MS. KING: Thank you, Your Honor.

21

2.2.

23

24

25

THE COURT: If you have anything else to say.

MS. KING: I do. I want to make it clear that the

Government is never suggesting that the Defendant was on his way to shoot a police officer.

THE COURT: And I did not draw that inference.

MS. KING: Thank you. I would also point out that the reason that the Defendant's guideline range is at 210 to 262 months is because he does not get the benefit of three points off for acceptance of responsibility.

He's apparently continuing to assert his innocence, which is his right, but those three — if he had accepted responsibility and had pled guilty and had not gone to trial, his guideline range would be 180 months essentially.

And so -- and I think that's something else that the Court should take into consideration, is Mr. Warren has now testified twice under oath on the stand relative to prior convictions saying things that are extremely beneficial to himself.

Today he's continued to disavow his responsibility in this case, which we did hear testimony at trial from two officers really separately, one who observed him with a gun and one who interviewed him about it, and both of their stories show that he had a gun that day and was holding a gun that day, which he continues to deny —

THE COURT: I think the jury found that beyond a reasonable doubt.

MS. KING: Yes, Your Honor. And so it seems though

2.2.

as though — you know, he's saying he never would have accepted his plea deal for his armed robbery case if this had not happened, and I have to say from personal conversations

I've had with people in the State's office in Baltimore, that is not essentially a true statement.

Those types of things happened in many criminal cases in Baltimore where, if a person successfully finishes out their probation, then it is possible that they can receive some type of verdict without judgment or their probation — or their verdict can be vacated after the fact.

But in fact, this Defendant violated his probation and continued to commit crimes while he was on probation. So there's no way they told me that that would have ever happened, that his case would have ever been vacated because he continued to violate.

So instead of accepting his responsibility for his actions, his past actions and his present actions, he continues to make excuses for them, and I find that to be very concerning. And I think that the Court should consider that in determining what an appropriate sentence is; and that's another reason why we do think that a guideline sentence is appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King.

I would note that it's 10:25. I would like to take a brief recess. We'll resume approximately 10:35, 10:40,

1 somewhere in that range. 2 So, Deputies, however you want to handle that, 3 that's all up to you. Is Mr. Warren going to stay in the 4 courtroom, or are you going to assist him somewhere else? 5 It's up to you. 6 THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, we'll probably take him 7 back to use the restroom. 8 THE COURT: So Mr. Babik, why don't you recess the 9 court at this point, and then the Marshals can assist 10 Mr. Warren. 11 (A recess was taken at 10:26 a.m.) 12 (10:47 a.m.; in open court, Defendant present:) 13 THE COURT: Miss Rowe, we'll note we're back on the 14 record. The Defendant, Mr. Warren, is present represented by 15 his lawyer, Mr. Schorr. Miss King is present on behalf of 16 the United States. The Probation Officer Waszyn is present 17 also. 18 Mr. Schorr, are there any other matters to come to 19 the Court's attention prior to sentencing? 20 MR. SCHORR: Well, Your Honor, Mr. Warren told me 21 he would like to speak to clarify a couple points on the 2.2. record. I told him I would ask if we could do so, but I told 23 him to be brief --24 THE COURT: He absolutely can do so. And 25 Mr. Warren, and then, Mr. Schorr, when Mr. Warren's done,

1 we'll make sure that both Miss King and you have the 2 opportunity to tell the Court anything else you'd like to 3 tell the Court, if there is anything else. Mr. Warren, sir, I'm happy to hear from you again. 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: I don't mean to be bothersome --6 THE COURT: You're not bothersome, Mr. Warren. 7 THE DEFENDANT: Those three points that Miss King 8 -- well, the two points Miss King made and the one point my 9 I was in the process of going to trial with the lawyer made. 10 armed robberies. The Judge stopped me in the middle of the 11 trial --12 THE COURT: Down in Baltimore City? 13 In Baltimore City for the Yes. THE DEFENDANT: 14 armed robberies that led to this situation right now. 15 Judge made an offer of ten years, seven years suspended, 16 three years jail time, four years probation. He wanted to 17 let me go home that day, but the prosecutor said they wanted 18 jail time. 19 The plea arrangement that was worked out was once I 20 complete my probation, which I successfully completed without 21 committing any more crimes like Miss King stipulated to --22 THE COURT: What I heard Miss King say is that you violated your probation. 23 24 THE DEFENDANT: I never violated. That's why --25 because if it was a violation, you would see it on my

1 criminal history, just like all the other violations of the 2 probation I did -- there's nowhere in the copy that she 3 provided, Your Honor. That's the first point. 4 The armed robberies were never supposed to be on my 5 That's the second point. And the third point is 6 that -- well, there's two more points. 7 Mr. Duwane Hayes is no relative to me at all. 8 the son of the lady I was renting from, the stabbing 9 victim --10 THE COURT: The gentleman on the front porch? 11 THE DEFENDANT: On the front porch. He's not 12 related to me at all. I never said that at all, and I 13 advised my lawyer -- because he's not my trial lawyer -- I 14

never possessed a qun. I wasn't going to seek revenge on anything of that nature.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

And I wanted to clear that up because, as I said, he wasn't my trial lawyer, and I wanted to put that on the record. I never touched the gun. I stand by that, good or bad. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Warren. Thank you, sir. Mr. Schorr, is there anything you'd like to say as a consequence of what Mr. Warren has now told the Court or additionally told the Court or any other reasons?

MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor. I think I'm done for the day.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schorr. Miss King, same 2 opportunity, if there's anything else you'd like to add to 3 the record? MS. KING: No, thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King. Thank you, Mr. 6 Schorr. 7 The Court has set forth the calculation of the 8 advisory guidelines as the Court has calculated them based on 9 the rulings that it's made regarding the various matters set 10 forth in the presentence report, the positions of the United 11 States and the defense in those regards. 12 The base offense level is 24 under Section 13 There's an upward adjustment of four levels 2K2.1(a)(2). 14 under 2K2.1(b)(4)(B). Pursuant to Section 4B1.4(b)(3)(B), 15 the total offense level goes to 33. 16 The Court has calculated the criminal history 17 category at 5, which places the matter in Zone 2 of the 18 sentencing table. The advisory quidelines recommend a term 19 of imprisonment of 210 to 262 months. Probation is not 20 authorized by statute. 21 There's a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment of 22 180 months. The Court must impose a term of supervised 23 release not exceeding five years. The advisory guidelines recommend a fine ranging from \$17,500 to \$175,000. 24

Restitution is not applicable in the case.

25

2.2.

Forfeiture is of one Taurus Judge .45LC/.410 pistol with a serial number having the last four digits of 4363. There is a special assessment of \$100 applicable to any sentence.

Mr. Warren, under the Sentencing Reform Act, there are a broad array of materials that I'm allowed to consider. There's certain factors I'm obligated to consider. These include the nature and circumstances of the offense as set forth in the record in this case, the presentence report and the addendum.

I'm also to consider your history and characteristics, as set forth at length in the presentence report and the addendum. This includes, among other things, your family and personal data, physical condition, mental and emotional health, educational and vocational skills and your employment record.

I can confirm for the record that I've considered all of the information I'm legally permitted to consider. This includes all of the matters I've set forth earlier in the hearing today, the arguments made by your lawyer and by the lawyer for the United States and your statements to the Court.

It's my obligation as the Judge, Mr. Warren, to set a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing. I'll now briefly review them and state how each of them applies in this case.

2.2.

The first is to reflect the seriousness of the offense. The fact that Congress by law has set a mandatory minimum sentence in this case of 180 months is in the Court's estimation a reflection of the degree to which society considers the offense to be serious.

People that have been previously convicted of felonies and have had multiple prior felony convictions simply are not to possess firearms in our society. That is an important and vital law in keeping communities, neighborhoods, households safe. So it is a very, very serious offense, and it is a serious offense that is, as I've used the phrase, amplified by the fact of your prior criminal record.

You possessed a firearm. You knew it was one that you could not possess at all. By the fact of the obliteration of the serial numbers, it should have in essence doubled down the degree to which you would have known and should have known you cannot possess that firearm.

I recognize in your statements to the Court,
Mr. Warren, your position that you did not possess that
firearm. I understand your statements here in court today.

A jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that you possessed the firearm. And in the Court's estimation there was more than sufficient evidence for them to reach that conclusion. That's the conclusion that's binding on the

Court. That's the conclusion that's binding here at sentencing.

2.2.

So by any measure, this is a very serious offense.

The second factor the Court's to consider is the necessity of the sentence to promote respect for the law. A review of the presentence report notes that, in addition to the qualifying convictions, that is, the convictions that led to the categorization of this crime, it's the possession of a firearm by an armed career criminal, you had other serious convictions, including one for assault and a different and separate and distinct drug conviction.

To your credit, it appears that you left, and the presentence report does reflect that you left Baltimore in order to get a fresh start, to be in a different place, to be, as you've used the phrase, accurately in the Court's estimation, around different people, places and things.

But by the same token, it is not simply the qualifying convictions that are present in your criminal record. You had a significant criminal record.

The fact of you possessing a firearm, for however long you possessed it, was a separate and distinct criminal offense. But by the same token, you did come to Pittsburgh. You were not charged with, arrested for, other criminal activity.

By phrasing it that way, I'm not minimizing your

2.2.

possession of a firearm, but you were not engaged in other criminal activity when you moved here to get away from the situation in Baltimore. So in many ways, Mr. Warren, that sentencing factor has elements to it that cut both ways.

The third sentencing factor is to provide just and sound punishment for the offense with which you're convicted. By law I'm required to sentence you to a term of imprisonment of at least 180 months. By any measure, that is a significant punishment by any society on another human being. So the sentence that's imposed here will reflect a just and sound punishment for the offense you have been convicted of.

I'm to afford adequate deterrence to further criminal conduct by you and by others in society.

I'm not certain what your future is going to carry, Mr. Warren, other than, as Mr. Schorr has accurately pointed out, you're going to be in Federal prison for a long time.

As to others in society, as I've noted earlier,

Congress, that is, the elected representatives of the people
of the United States, along with the President that signed
the law, have concluded with reason that convicted felons
with long records of serious other felony convictions have to
know they cannot possess a firearm. They just can't.

And society has set a punishment, has set a sentence that is by any measure significant in order to deter other people from doing what you're convicted of doing here.

2.2.

So I do believe the sentence is intended to reflect a mechanism to both deter you and other people in society from this type of conduct.

I'm to consider the application of the now advisory sentencing guidelines, any applicable policy statements and sentencing factors.

In this case, the principal reason that the sentencing guidelines were amplified to the degree they are is your status as an armed career criminal. That presents a mandatory minimum sentence of 180 months. The advisory guidelines reflect a term of what is in essence 17 1/2 to more than 20 years, 210 to 262 months.

In some significant measure in the Court's mind, there is a meaningful and real overlap between the mandatory minimum sentence and the intention of that mandatory minimum sentence as set forth in the statute that created it and the acceleration, if you will, of the advisory guidelines in your case. It's not a complete overlap, but in the Court's estimation, it is a considerable overlap.

I've noted on the record and in the amended tentative findings what your sentence would be but for the application of the armed career criminal enhancements.

Whether or not this mandatory — or the maximum sentence had been 120 months or not, it would have been notably less than the 180 months or anything in that range and certainly

notably less than 210 to 262 months.

2.2.

Miss King as the lawyer for the Government is correct that, had you entered a plea of guilty, you would have received a credit of three offense levels, three points, if you will, for acceptance of responsibility.

I'm not stating a general rule or rule that I would apply in all cases because I'm not yet certain, but I also am not confident that the guidelines carry the same weight in making that judgment because somebody elects to go to trial.

This was a case that was based on eyewitness testimony. The testimony of the police officers was unequivocal. It was not rebutted by other physical evidence at the scene. But it was a trial that turned on credibility, and the jury made a credibility determination. They believed the police officers.

And in the Court's estimation, the jury had more than a reasonable basis to believe the police officers. But if there are cases that go to trial, the Court is not surprised that it was this case and this kind of case that went to trial because of the nature of the evidence that was involved here.

So while I recognize and don't minimize the accuracy of Miss King's statement in those regards, that's really not a factor that weighs into the Court's assessment of how to consider the advisory guidelines in this case.

2.2.

I'm to consider the types and kinds of sentences that are available. As I've noted, I'm required to sentence you to a term of imprisonment, Mr. Warren. Even if that mandatory minimum sentence was not present here, the Court would conclude that the crime of which you've been convicted does require a long, meaningful term of imprisonment in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

I would also note apart from — and I'm not minimizing the appropriateness of the submission from the United States regarding the abilities and capabilities of the Bureau of Prisons, the Court is confident that the Bureau of Prisons in a variety of settings can accommodate your specific needs, medical, emotional, psychological, surgical that would present themselves in a number of settings available to the Bureau of Prisons. So I have considered the types and kinds of sentences that are available.

The next factor is to protect the public from the commission of further crimes by you, Mr. Warren. I'm not certain how that would have played out. I did not draw the inference, and I recognize Miss King's confirmation of not intending that I draw the inference. I didn't draw the conclusion that you came down the stairs with the Taurus firearm in order to wound, kill, shoot or do anything to police officers.

But where I think the United States is correct in

those regards, is when you came down the stairs with that gun into a situation that was already chaotic, where there was already a person gravely injured, it ramps up in any number of ways the risk of a series of bad things happening next.

I don't know what your motive was in bringing the gun down, whether it was to protect yourself, to protect your relatives that you lived with, to protect what was going on at the scene or if it was something far more negative than that. But either way, a decision to bring down a gun that you had no legal authority to have, in fact, it was prohibited by law from you having, injected a risk of danger and harm into the situation.

That demonstrates to me, Mr. Warren, that notwithstanding the fact that since you've come to Pittsburgh you haven't been involved in other criminal activity other than the possession of this firearm, that risk of danger and the risk of harm is still something that is part of you. So that is a factor that I've considered in the sentencing.

I'm to provide any needed educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. I make the recommendations requested by your lawyer, Mr. Schorr, that you be placed as close as possible to Baltimore, Maryland, that you be placed at a suitable federal medical facility.

I will make a specific recommendation that it be

2.2.

FMC Butner. It is a wide-ranging, full-service, all-level medical facility of the Bureau of Prisons. It is I suspect of all the Federal Medical Centers reasonably close to Baltimore. I'm not imposing the sentence, but I am imposing an order to get you the medical care, but within the context of the sentence that is being imposed.

We'll make those recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons. As I suspect Mr. Schorr has told you, Mr. Warren, I can't order the Bureau of Prisons to do that. But I will make that formal recommendation in writing because it certainly fits the facts of your case.

I'm to avoid any undue or unjust disparities in sentencing. I believe the sentence as imposed will do that, particularly in light of the mandatory minimum sentence that is in play in your case.

Finally, I do believe I have ruled upon all of the sentencing arguments that have been made by your lawyer on your behalf and made by Miss King on behalf of the United States.

It's my fundamental obligation, Mr. Warren, to provide for a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary, which means that I will set a sentence that in the Court's judgment fulfills the purposes of sentencing but then goes no further.

Any sentence imposed must and will relate

specifically to you, your conduct and situation.

2.2.

As I've noted, there are factors in your life that cut in each direction, Mr. Warren. You had a relatively long period of time back in Pittsburgh. You made the decision to leave Baltimore, which was an environment in which you were committing other crimes.

I am not considering as an infirmative factor the choice that you made to go to trial for the reasons I've stated. I have noted you had a gun that you should have known was illegal, both to possess at all and to possess with the obliterated serial number, which reflects the illegality of its possession. You did have a prior record of serious crimes beyond those that were considered for qualifying offenses.

By the same token, I know, as Mr. Schorr has stated on the record on your behalf and as reported and detailed in the presentence report, at least the principal — what I consider the principal qualifying offense, the armed robbery, occurred quite some time ago. It doesn't mean it was not serious. But it also was not with a weapon that was actually capable of killing somebody. But the law for good reason treats it that way in terms of the crime. And your personal history and permanent record is one that presented a lot of challenges to you.

By the same token, you've made a lot of bad

2.2.

choices. All told, Mr. Warren, the record that you come to court with in the context of your conviction is one that has matters in it that cut, as I've noted, in each direction.

I do specifically find that a sentence within the advisory guideline range would be a sentence that in the specific facts of your case would be a sentence that's greater than necessary to fulfill the purposes of sentencing.

I understand the arguments of the United States.

I'm not diminishing them. I'm not saying they're not well
taken. But to fulfill the purposes of sentencing, sentencing
you to federal prison for 17 1/2 to 22 years is not necessary
in the Court's estimation to fulfill the purposes of
sentencing that I've stated.

I do find that a sentence that is amplified above what your sentence would have been without the armed career criminal designation is appropriate, because I think that Congress in passing that statute and making those designations has reflected important societal interest, that society cannot have people with your record possessing guns. They just can't. It poses too great a risk to too many people.

Based on all the factors and for the reasons I've stated on the record, Mr. Warren, the sentence of the Court is as follows:

You're sentenced to a term of imprisonment in the

2.2.

custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons of 192 months. I will recommend, as I've noted, that you serve that at a Federal Medical Facility for as much of your sentence as that care is necessary and that you be as close to Baltimore, Maryland, as the BOP can place you consistent with your correctional treatment needs. I find you cannot pay a fine, so no fine will be imposed.

Restitution is not applicable. The sentencing judgment will include forfeiture of one Taurus Judge .45LC/.410 caliber pistol with serial number ending in the last four digits 4363. There will be a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

You will be placed on a term of supervised release of five years applicable upon your release from Federal prison. In a moment, Mr. Warren, I'm going to go over the rules and conditions that apply to that.

I will advise you that, should you violate any of the rules or conditions of supervised release, I could be asked to revoke your supervised release. If that happened, Mr. Warren, you could be sent back to Federal prison, and you would not receive credit for time that you had already served on supervised release.

You're going to have to report to the probation office in the district to which you're released within 72 hours of being released from the custody of the Bureau of

Prisons.

2.2.

While on supervised release, Mr. Warren, you cannot commit, shall not commit any Federal, State or local crime. You have to abide by all of the standard conditions of supervision recommended by the Sentencing Commission and adopted by the Court.

I'll highlight the following, Mr. Warren:
You cannot illegally possess a controlled substance.

You shall not possess a firearm, ammunition, destructive device or any other dangerous weapon.

You're going to have to participate in any mental health assessment or treatment programs directed by the probation office until released from them by the Court.

You may be required to contribute to the costs of services provided in an amount not exceeding the actual cost. And the probation office will be authorized to release your presentence report to any treatment provider, if requested.

Given the specific nature of the offense of conviction in your case, Mr. Warren, you have to submit your person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, business or place of employment to a search conducted by the probation office at any reasonable time and in any reasonable manner based on a reasonable suspicion of the presence of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of supervision.

2.2.

Your failure to submit to such a search could be grounds in and of itself for revocation.

You have to tell anybody else that is present at those premises that those locations could be subject to a search.

You will be required to participate in an alcohol aftercare program as directed by the probation office, which may include alcohol testing. You cannot consume alcohol while you're on supervised release, given your record as reported in the presentence report. You may be required to contribute to the cost of those services in an amount not exceeding the actual cost.

You will be required to participate in a program of testing, evaluation and, if necessary, treatment for substance abuse, as may be directed by the probation office until you would be released from such a program by the Court. You may be required to contribute to the costs of services in an amount not exceeding the actual cost.

This will include random drug testing with at least one test within 15 days of going on supervision and at least two tests thereafter. You cannot intentionally purchase, possess or use any substance or device designed to affect or alter in any way that testing protocol.

You have to cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation office.

1 As I've noted, Mr. Warren, no fine will be imposed 2 because you cannot pay a fine. And there is a special 3 assessment of \$100. I find that the sentence as imposed fulfills each 4 5 of the purposes of sentencing, as I've stated them on the 6 record for each of the reasons I've stated. 7 Mr. Waszyn, is there anything about the Court's 8 oral pronouncement of sentence that you as the probation 9 officer believe needs to be amended, corrected or modified in 10 to any way? 11 MR. WASZYN: No, Your Honor. 12 Thank you, Mr. Waszyn. Miss King, does THE COURT: 13 the United States have any objection to the reasonableness of 14 the sentence as imposed? 15 MS. KING: No, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, same question of you? 17 MR. SCHORR: Well, I think 180 months would have 18 been more than sufficient, Your Honor. So I'm not quite sure 19 how you got the 192, but that's within your discretion. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. SCHORR: I mean I don't think it's reasonable, 2.2. but I mean I said before --23 THE COURT: Well, more precisely, it's a procedural 24 reasonableness, and I believe you've preserved all your 25 objections to the calculation of the now advisory guideline

range and the application of the armed career criminal enhancement at all in this case. So those are preserved.

Is there anything else that I should hear now based on our Third Circuit's decisions and the Supreme Court's decisions?

MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor.

2.2.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schorr. Are there any other recommendations that you want to make that you're asking me to make to the Bureau of Prisons on Mr. Warren's behalf other than the ones you've stated?

As to the calculation of time in custody and credit towards his sentence, my understanding is that that's not something I can even influence by recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons.

It's always my belief, and I'll be happy to state it in the sentencing judgment, that Mr. Warren should receive credit for any time served to the fullest extent of the law. But that's a calculation that the Bureau of Prisons makes.

MR. SCHORR: I understand that. Perhaps to that end, if you put in the judgment of conviction that he had originally been arrested by the City police and held in State custody, and that case was dismissed after he was charged Federally. So that they are aware that there is a period of time when he was in custody, I believe it was five months. I understand they make the determination, but they want to be

1 satisfied from what I understand in previous cases that 2 nobody else has used that time. 3 THE COURT: Right. MR. SCHORR: And that's the key. I want --4 5 whatever you can put in the record that that time has not 6 been used. 7 THE COURT: Is that in the presentence report, 8 Mr. Waszyn? 9 MR. WASZYN: It is, Your Honor. It's clearly 10 stated. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I will note that in the 12 sentencing judgment. I'll highlight that, that the Bureau of 13 Prisons should consider that as reported in the presentence 14 report. And then they'll take a look at that. 15 MR. SCHORR: And in the presentence report, there's 16 mention made of Mr. Warren's mental health issues, possible 17 mental health issues. I've spoken with the Bureau of 18 Prisons, and they told me that the sentence or two that was 19 involved there was sufficient; but can you recommend that 20 they take a look at his psychological needs? I would 21 appreciate that. 2.2. THE COURT: I would add that as part of the 23 recommendation, as to the recommendation at FMC Butner. 24 In light of that, I will add a condition to the

supervised release that, when Mr. Warren is released, the

25

probation office determines whether — it actually is in their condition number three, the mental health assessment.

So I will add that, Mr. Schorr, to the recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons.

Miss King, does the United States have any objection to any of the recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons as articulated by Mr. Schorr?

MS. KING: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. They'll be made in the sentencing judgment, Mr. Schorr.

MR. SCHORR: Thank you.

2.2.

THE COURT: I will confirm for the record that I believe the 192-month sentence I believe did a number of things to reflected the totality of Mr. Warren's life as reported in the presentence report, his prior criminal record, the nature and circumstances of those offenses.

It gave due and fair consideration to the calculated advisory guideline range and measured each of those factors against the benchmark of a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to fulfill the purposes of sentencing.

Mr. Warren, I advise you of your appeal rights as follows, sir. You have the right to appeal from each and every one of the Orders of the Court, the judgment of guilt, and the sentence that's been imposed by the Court.

1 So you do have those rights, Mr. Warren. You have 2 the right to be represented by a lawyer in any appeal. 3 you cannot afford a lawyer, one will be appointed for you at no cost to you. Do you understand that, sir? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, if you cannot afford 7 certified copies of any necessary court records, they will be 8 provided to you at the expense of the Federal Government. 9 you understand that, sir? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, I advise you that should 12 you not be able to afford the filing fee for an appeal, the 13 Court would enter an Order that waives your obligation to pay 14 an appellate filing fee. Do you understand that, sir? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, I advise you that if you do 17 want to appeal, you must do so, that is, appeal within 14 18 days of today. If you do not appeal within 14 days of today, 19 you would lose your rights to an appeal. Do you understand 20 that, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Warren, I advise you that if you 23 would request, that the Clerk of our Court here in Pittsburgh 24 would prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf. Do

25

you understand that, sir?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Schorr, are there any other matters
3	that you believe we should take up today or that you'd like
4	to bring to the Court's attention on Mr. Warren's behalf?
5	MR. SCHORR: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schorr.
7	Miss King, are there any other matters the United
8	States believes we should take up today or that you would
9	like the Court to pay attention to at this time?
10	MS. KING: No, thank you, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, Miss King.
12	Mr. Waszyn, sir, are there any other matters that
13	the probation office believes the Court needs to address
14	during this sentencing hearing?
15	MR. WASZYN: No, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Waszyn. In a moment
17	we'll adjourn court. I'd ask those present in the courtroom
18	to remain seated and at ease while the deputies assist
19	Mr. Warren.
20	(Proceedings were concluded at 11:19 a.m.)
21	
22	CERTIFICATE
23	I, Deborah Rowe, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
24	above-titled matter.
25	S/Deborah Rowe Certified Realtime Reporter